DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 560 HE 003 687

TITLE	Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women at CUNY. Public Hearings Testimony: An Edited Summary and Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y. Brooklyn Coll.
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	77p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Females; *Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Professors; *Womens Education; *Working Women

ABSTRACT

In December 1971 a committee was appointed at the City University of New York (CUNY) to recommend meaningful changes in policy to meet the problem of discrimination and to advance the status of women at CUNY. Public hearings were held in February and April of 1972, and faculty, students and staff were invited to testify regarding prejudicial practices at the various colleges. The testimony pointed to the existence at CUNY of some general attitudes about women and their proper roles in academia and the larger society. Precisely how these attitudes affect the status of women at CUNY was made abundantly clear by witness after witness. Thus, in order to understand why the status of women employed at CUNY is so uniformly low, this condensed report of the public hearings testimony begins with a consideration of the image of women. It then moves on to consider the status of women at CUNY, specifically with regard to recruitment, promotions, salaries, policy-making, parenthood, grievances and complaints, and the academic curriculum. A third and final section deals with the CUNY affirmative action program and its application and relevance. (HS)

ED 071560

CHANCELLOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT CUNY

Public Hearings Testimony:

An Edited Summary and Evaluation

●

September 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE003687

CUNY COLLEGE: FOUNDING DATES

DATE	COLLEGE
1970	*Medgar Evers College
1968	Eugenio Maria De Hostos Community College
1968	Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College
1966	*York College
1965	*Richmond College
1964	*John Jay College of Criminal Justice
1963	Borough of Manhattan Community College
1963	Kingsborough Community College
1963	University Graduate Division
1963	Mount Sinai School of Medicine
1958	Queensborough Community College
1957	Bronx Community College
1955	Staten Island Community College
1946	New York City Community College
1937	*Queens College
1931	*Herbert H. Lehman College
1930	*Brooklyn College
1919	*Bernard M. Baruch College
1870	*Hunter College
1847	*The City College

*Indicates senior (4-year) college

ED 071560

CHANCELLOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT CUNY

PUBLIC HEARINGS TESTIMONY: AN EDITED SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

SEPTEMBER 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PART I: THE IMAGE OF WOMEN 2

PART II: THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT CUNY 8

A. Recruitment 10

B. Promotions 17

C. Salaries 33

D. Policy-Making 37

E. Parenthood 40

F. Grievances & Complaints 49

G. Academic Curriculum 53

PART III: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION 56

PART IV: CONCLUSION 65

APPENDIX: LIST OF WITNESSES

INTRODUCTION

In December 1971, Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee appointed an Advisory Committee on the Status of Women at CUNY to recommend meaningful changes in policy to meet the problem of discrimination against women and to advance the status of women at CUNY. "Its mission is important," said Chancellor Kibbee, "not only for CUNY, but because it suggests a new mechanism for providing university administrators with women's perspective in matters relating to employment of women."

Prior to the formation of the Advisory Committee and in compliance with the President's Executive Orders 11246 and 11375, an Affrimative Action report was submitted to the Chancellor by the CUNY Affirmative Action Committee. Subsequent thereto, and after several meetings of the Advisory Committee on the Status of Women, it was determined that the affirmative action report submitted did not fully reflect the depth or sources of discrimination against women and minoirities at CUNY. It was, therefore, decided by the Committee that one of its top priorities would be the pursuit of additional data regarding the status of women through further research; thereby supplementing, expanding, and rectifying the information contained in the original affirmative action report.

In furtherance of these goals, and as part of its data gathering process, the Committee held two days of public hearings--February 29, and April 27, 1972--inviting the faculty, staff, and students of the University to testify regarding prejudicial practices at the various colleges. Over 30,000 notices announcing each hearing were distributed in an attempt to inform every person

connected with CUNY of the hearings. In addition, a special effort was made to invite the president and the affirmative action coordinator of each college to appear because of her/his important role in the long range program to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women from the CUNY system.

In all, 57 people appeared at the public hearings and produced well over 400 pages of testimony covering every aspect of the role of women within the CUNY system--past, present, and future.* Several interested persons who were unable to appear publically, or who chose not to do so, submitted written statements to the Committee.

Not surprisingly, the testimony pointed to the existence at CUNY of some general attitudes about women and their proper role(s) in academia and the larger society. Precisely how these attitudes affect the status of women at CUNY was made abundantly clear by witness after witness. Thus, in order to understand why the status of women employed at CUNY is so uniformly low, this condensed report of the public hearings testimony begins with a consideration of the "image of women." It then moves on to consider the "status of women at CUNY." A third, and final, section deals with the CUNY affirmative action program--its application and relevance.

The Committee used the testimony of the public hearings to determine sev-

*These hearings were meant to deal exclusively with the problem of sex discrimination at CUNY. Nonetheless, several people addressed themselves to other subjects, primarily the status of Puerto Ricans at CUNY. Some witnesses also questioned the structure of the Committee. And, one male witness criticized the all-female composition of the Committee. Their remarks can be found in the full testimony.

eral of the areas for its research investigation into the policies and practices in regard to women at CUNY. By preparing this condensation of the testimony, as well as its research study of the status of women at CUNY, Report to the Chancellor (1972), the Committee hopes that it will reach an audience both within and beyond the audience of the City University of New York, and therby make a fruitful contribution to the current public discussion on the status and education of women in America.

MEMBERS

CHANCELLOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT CUNY

Blanche D. Blank

Marilyn Gittell, Chairperson

Irene Impellizzeri

Zelda Jonas

Ann Marcus

Sylvia Martin

Virginia Sexton

Patricia Stonewall

Elizabeth Wickenden

Katherine M. Klotzburger
Project Director

PART I: THE IMAGE OF WOMEN

Sex discrimination is socially acceptable prejudice.

Dean Ruth Weintraub (I, 50)

To anyone familiar with the contemporary literature on women, the attitudes about women at CUNY that were conveyed by the witnesses correspond to a familiar pattern in American society: the City University merely reflects and reinforces the ideologies accepted by society at large. Although some of the testimony in this regard pertains exclusively to the field of higher education, much of it could have just as easily come from hearings held within the business or industrial community, the medical profession, or the church.

Most witnesses felt that the most common assumption about women is that they are equipped to be wives and mothers to the exclusion of any other pursuit they may wish to undertake. Sue Tolchin, a former CUNY faculty member, noted that:

> . . . comments casually made revealed an inherent hostility toward me as a woman, and especially as a woman who had produced while so many male colleagues languished.
>
> "How are the babies," asked my colleagues everytime they happened to encounter me.
>
> "The babies are fine," I would reply. "Don't you want to hear about the book I've just published?"
>
> No one really did. Whether this was anti-intellectualism, as some have suggested, or anti-feminism, which

> I'm inclined to think, the plain fact that my colleagues preferred to reinforce their image of me as a mother rather than as a scholar--negating the scholar almost completely--added yet another shock to my already shaken sensibilities. (Written Testimony)

In a similar vein, Dorothy Buckton James, associate professor at Lehman College noted that:

> . . . many of our female students complain that male faculty members discourage their interest in law or graduate school on the grounds that they will marry. I have certainly seen patterns of behavior among my colleagues to accept as natural the desire of any male student to discuss professional career goals, but to require women to justify similar desires. (Written Testimony)

The two assumptions, first that women do not really belong in a non-domestic setting, and second, that marriage is the primary goal in their lives, have created a corollary--when women do work, it is primarily for amusement. Assistant Professor Marlene Karakashian of Queens College:

> I went to see a senior member of my department to discuss my reserach interest with him. . . . He listened to me briefly and then advised me in a fatherly way to go home and have a talk with my husband about it--my husband is also a biologist--before taking any more of his time. He then told me he envied my being able to "play around in the laboratory" since it was clear that I didn't really need a job or have to worry about job security. This person is a major power in the graduate program in my area

of biology. (I, 199)

Professor James:

> . . . a recent letter [of recommendation] received by the Lehman History Department from a Princeton professor detailed an excellent academic record but ended with a statement that of course the candidate was a woman and therefore her professor could not assess the "seriousness" of her professional interest. (Written Testimony)

Carmen Aita, a graduate student in physics, who was twice denied summer work within her department, suggested that the major reason for this happening was one of her professor's attitudes toward women:

> I am studying towards a doctorate degree. I am as serious as any male. . . . The purpose of giving summer work is to tide serious graduate students over the summer because our pay . . . is so low.
>
> Because I didn't recieve any summer work two years in a row, I quit the second year. I was told I didn't fit into any of the criteria used to establish which students should get summer work. Last year, I didn't fit into any of the criteria. The criteria changed from this year to the last year as my studies changed. That is the direct result of the professor responsible for giving summer work having his moral values and his religious values infringed upon by my existence. He has seven children and a wife who stays home. He believes that women, when they are married, should resign from all intellectual pursuits, studying physics is one of them, and stay home. . . . He was explicit in telling

me this, too. (II, 101-102)

Another witness, Dean Claire Sprague of John Jay College, quoted an article, "Women in Academia," by Arie Y. Lewin and Linda Duchan, that appeared in Science (Vol. 173), September 1971, which confirmed the existence of the feeling that women were not welcome in academia:

> . . . [the] study fabricated four nearly identical resumes in a physical science: two average versions, one a male, and one a female; one excellent female version and one superior female version.
>
> The results showed that all chairman chose the average male over the average female although they did recognize the superior qualifications of the superior female. Furthermore, a significant number of unsolicited comments were returned for the female applicants. They included concern over what the woman's husband would do if she were hired, how she would manage her child care obligations--all fictive applicants were given two children--and questioned her personality, especially her compatibility, that is, her ability to fit in with the department. (I, 155)

"Perhaps even more pernicious than the obvious kinds of discrimination that every woman alive has suffered," continued Sprague, "is the psychological crippling of both sexes that these practices both entail and reflect. Men must succeed. Women must not."

> How much women fear to excel, how low women set their expectations, how much women are conflicted about combining career and family, we are just beginning to learn. (I, 156)

Two other witnesses spoke about the treatment of women, particularly the double standard by which women are judged. Cisley P. Stewart-Huntley of Hunter College:

> . . . subjective things . . . are usually spoken about women. When, whatever you do is evaluated, it's not evaluated in terms of concrete subjects, but rather in terms of moods, motions, emotions, whatever. (II, 135)

Professor Esther Milner of Brooklyn College:

> If a young, up-and-coming male Ph.D. were to manifest such characteristics as intellectual honesty and creativity, articulate forthrightness on behalf of thought-out positions, inner-directed drive for achievement, task-centeredness to the point of commitment to cooperate with others towards common work-goals, tendency to relate to others in the institutional hierarchy on a peer rather than a status or power basis, his fellow professionals, both senior and peers, would rather quickly accord him the personal approval-reinforcement and professional recognition such qualities have traditionally merited in our professedly open society. But, if a young woman Ph.D. happens to possess these very same characteristics, the response she receives from her male fellow professionals is likely to be very, very different. She is perceived as a "castrating" woman; i.e., as an ego-attacking threat to be shunted aside by whatever overtly fair or covertly foul means the vulnerable man can muster.

It is interesting in this connection that even the best trained applied psychologist behaves typically, quite unconcerned about the psychological damage--i.e., castration--that such treatment inflicts on the woman involved. (II, 74-75)

The commonly held attitude that women belong in one sphere of life and men in another has created, according to several of the witnesses, a fraternal atmosphere among men at CUNY. Not surprisingly, they felt that this atmosphere was cherished by the male staff members and would not be easily relinquished even in the name of equality. Adrienne Berenson, assistant professor of Queensborough Community College:

> There are subtle and not-so-subtle forms of discrimination at meetings and in faculty groups which occur, I think, as a result of men's accomplishments as role players, and women's being expected to respond as audience. During our campus disturbance of 1969, I simply could not get the floor, despite a proliferation of meetings: faculty meetings, faculty Council meetings, P[ersonnel] and B[udget] meetings, [and] peace conventions. (I, 143)

The "clubby" atmosphere at CUNY is not limited to dealings with employees the witnesses insisted; graduate students, and by extension, undergraduates, are affected as well. Esther Milner discussed this problem:

> Beginning in the graduate student years, the range of entering jobs available to a woman doctoral candidate is, typically, more restricted than those available to a man with comparable credentials; they are more likely to be

of a straight "service" type such as undergraduate teaching and research--or teaching-assistant. With the possible exception of women's colleges, apprentice-administrative and apprentice-research director positions are very rarely available to a woman, no matter how out-standingly suitable her personal and professional qualifications may be for such responsibilities. . . .

In the academic-research work, the real crunch comes after the first few years of experience. There is a process of being "groomed" for the more significant research and higher-level academic slots by an established person in one's field. Such a senior person, heretofore almost invariably male, plays a major role in helping a promising junior colleague to obtain his first sizeable research grant and/or a one or two year fellowship with a prestigious research institute or center for "advanced studies." These are experiences which are absolutely essential in today's highly competitive academic world for access to the top levels of academic and professional recognition, advancement, [and] responsibility. And, opportunities of this sort have almost never been available to a woman no matter how bright, intellectually creative, and dedicated to her discipline she may be. (II, 71-73)

PART II: THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT CUNY

The City University of New York is a public higher education institution consisting of 20 semi-autonomous institutions: nine senior colleges (four-year institutions), eight community colleges (two-year institutions), an upper division college which admits students at the junior level, a University Graduate Division which offers doctoral degrees, and an affiliated medical school. It is the largest urban university system in the world, and the third largest public higher education system in the United States. At present, it serves roughly 230,000 students and employs approximately 22,000 faculty, administrators, and support staff persons.

The University was founded in 1961, although the system of municipal colleges traces its origins to 1847, when City College was founded. City and Hunter Colleges were placed under the direction of the Board of Higher Education (BHE) in 1926; Brooklyn and Queens Colleges were subsequently added to the system, and in 1961, the colleges then under the jurisdiction of the Board of Higher Education became the City University of New York, Since then, the University has undergone rapid growth, establishing several new colleges and providing for enrollment increases. Beginning in the fall of 1970, the University adopted a policy of Open Admissions, whereby every high school graduate who is a New York City resident has unrestricted, tuition-free access to one of the colleges of City University.

The faculty of the colleges of City University is unionized. In the late 1960s, after an election, the Board of Higher Education recognized two bargaining agents: the Legislative Conference (LC), which traces its origins

back to the 1930s, when it began lobbying of the legislative process in behalf of faculty interests, and the United Federation of College Teachers (UFCT), a relatively new group, that is strongly identified with the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) which represents the public school teachers. The LC basically represents the full-time CUNY faculty and non-instructional/administrative staff, while the UFCT primarily represents the part-time instructional staff. In other words, the promotional series of faculty titles--Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor--are covered by the agreement between the Board and the Legislative Conference, while the salary schedules for the lower faculty ranks of Lecturer (full-time), Lecturer (part-time), and the Adjunct titles are covered by the agreement between the Board and the United Federation of College Teachers. In the spring of 1972, shortly after the public hearings of the Committee were held, the LC and the UFCT voted to merge, becoming the Professional Staff Congress (PSC). The ramifications of this merger and of the new union contract that was to be negotiated with the BHE were unknown at the time of the publication of this overview of the public hearings.

The status of women employed within the CUNY system is low when compared to that of men. The Committee's Report to the Chancellor (1972) presents empirical evidence to document this assertion. Following is some of the strongest testimony from witnesses at the hearings. It presents several of the general issues and problems bearing on career security and advancement at CUNY--recruitment, rank distribution, promotion, and salary differentials--from the viewpoint of those who feel themsleves to be the victims of institutional sexism.

Recruitment

> In the four years that I acted as Dean of Social Sciences, men never hesitated to offer women jobs, but [they] asked for higher steps for men of similar qualifications.
>
> Dean Ruth Weintraub (I, 51)

One of the basic causes of the second-class status of women at CUNY is the recruitment system, which according to several witnesses, has failed to increase the number of women in the system. The Committee began its inquiry into the scope of this problem with testimony that indicated that an evaluation should be undertaken of the effect on women as candidates for positions of a word of mouth employment system as opposed to an open listing employment system. One witness expressed her belief that in the male-dominated academic community, the informal mechanism of the "buddy system" for placement effectively excludes women (and minority group individuals). (I, 31) Commented another witness:

> . . . there is altogether too much favoritism and privilege in the CUNY system. What will be the usefulness of [the Committee's] accumulating data on the number of women engaged in a department at a given time, if only one of them, as in my case, was engaged through a letter of application followed by a formal interview? What will be the usefulness of accumulating data on women's progress in salary and rank, when those who come in through favoritism and privilege gain their advancement at the very start? (I, 142)

It is no longer feasible to rationalize the absence of women from the

faculty of any college department in CUNY on the grounds that, "There simply aren't any qualified women in the field--if we could find one we'd hire her," said Dean Claire Sprague of John Jay College. Departments need to acquire statistical data related to the availability of women in their fields, for "despite their under-availability in certain fields, enough qualified women exist, whose status can improve so that the imbalance we are discussing can be appreciably righted." (I, 161)

Concerning the recruitment of female faculty members, Dean Julius Manson of Baruch College felt "that the local campuses can be helped immeasurably if CUNY can consider maintaining a roster of qualified people." (I, 94) Carl Rachlin, affirmative action coordinator at Hunter College, offered another possible means:

> . . . there are studies available which can help in the possibility of forming vigorous recruitment practices. There are numerous professional societies existing in every discipline. One of the things we have done at Hunter is to write to every one of the professional societies that have come to our attention and have asked them to help us locate qualified candidates. We are not trying to lower the standards of the University, but we are trying to find people who will fit in and who are qualified to work with the programs that exist at Hunter College and we are doing this, not only for women, but for blacks and Puerto Ricans, as well.
>
> I am not overly sanguine about the results, because

> . . . my president backs me down the line and so I have no problem on my level of taking the steps that are necessary to begin the process. Where the problem fails . . . is when it gets down to the department themselves . . . the department chairman . . . is not . . . that much concerned about his responsibilities to society as a whole, to seek very hard the women, the blacks, the Puerto Ricans, and the others, all of whom, in varying degrees have historically and are currently being discriminated against in the University. (I, 227-28)

The need for a radical change in the process of recruiting faculty emerged from the Committee's hearings as vital to the upgrading of women at CUNY. It may be necessary to expend more time and effort on attracting female faculty, indicated affirmative action coordinator, Dean Manson of Baruch College:

> When we send out our people to recruit people for faculty, who do they send out? Normally it is males on the staff. What do they expect to be doing? Probably spending time with their cronies--I am making a guess here, I don't have any facts to back up what I am saying, as to how time was spent by recruiters. My guess is they don't spend time looking for female colleagues to join our staff. (I, 92)

It may also be necessary to start the recruiting process much earlier, as early as high school, suggested one Committee member when addressing a witness from the field of engineering, to make girls aware of the various career

fields and to make them feel welcome in them. Dorothy Riddle of Richmond College and Victor Young of the Queensborough Community College Physics Department corroborated this. Riddle recommended that, "During recruitment at high schools, women students in particular, be encouraged through special workshops, etcetera, to pursue their education; and that appropriate information and financial assistance be made available." (I, 21) Young noted that particularly in his male sex-stereotyped field, recruiting of female faculty would have to begin at an early level:

> Our faculty includes one [woman] as an Assistant Professor out of a total of twelve. Our classes, however, run no higher percentage of females. This we very much regret, perhaps even more than the 11/1 faculty ratio. We are trying to increase interest among the girls (sic) of our college. (Written Testimony)

Dean Manson made the identical point regarding the field of business:

> When I asked generally what the trouble was, in connection with finding people for faculty positions, I was given what seems to be a very sensible explanation. After all, how many women are there in business who have Ph.D.'s who expect to be teaching courses in business. We don't have any on the faculty at the present time. So we have a problem really of building up a reservoir of talents . . . This will require a massive operation, where women would have to be directed, perhaps, towards getting graduate degrees in business, if we are going to make our faculty more respectable, . . . (I, 91-92)

The recruitment process extends to the job interview. Suzanne Levin, a recent Ph.D. graduate in biology, with extensive research experience, documented her interview with the Biology Department at Queens College in a letter to the Committee:

> Official Application form mailed 11/23/71. Reply 3/15/72 requesting a third letter of reference and stating that positions were either at the level of Instructor or Assistant Professor. The letter asked me to suggest dates for my visit and asked if I were willing to give a seminar or come for an interview. I replied within two days suggesting three dates and offering to give a seminar. Unwittingly, I chose three days that fell during the spring recess. However, I did not find out this fact from Queens College which never replied to my letter.
>
> I wrote again 4/5/72 suggesting alternate dates. Queens replied 4/10/72 that new Ph.D.'s were only being considered at the Instructor level and told me that there are no travel funds to pay my expenses but that they will interview me if I come to New York. I replied 4/13/72 suggesting two dates. They telephoned me confirming a date and time. No mention is made of a seminar.
>
> I kept the appointment which turned out to be, . . . the most depressing I have ever had. First, I was either kept waiting or shuffled around to whomever the chairman could corner at the moment for a large part of the afternoon. Second, when senior faculty were called in to meet me it was made plain . . . that they had lots of applicants, were not particularly interested

> in what I might want to say about ideas of teaching, etcetera, and wanted someone to teach three laboratory and three discussion sections. It was also conveyed to me that the people who now gave the course in question considered them little kingdoms and would not look kindly on Instructors wanting significant input into course content. . . . Fourth, there was a decided tendency to introduce me as Dr. Levin to secretaries, junior faculty, women faculty and as Sue Levin to senior (male) faculty. . . . I most certainly came away with the impression that Queens College Biology Department was not going to hire me; that they had made up their mind not to before I came for the interview. . . . (Written Testimony)

Admissions to undergraduate and graduate programs is analogous to the recruitment system for faculty. Several witnesses spoke to the Committee on the consequences of limited admissions policies of higher education institutions for women, although no direct charges against the CUNY colleges were voiced. Another problem regarding the admission of women to graduate school concerned the "regulations respecting age limitations, academic course requirements, and the financing and transfer of credits" which several witnesses felt should be revised to encourage women into academic life. Dean Ruth Weintraub of Hunter College discussed the problem in relation to mature women:

> Qualified mature women are in need of revised regulations. So many women who come to me . . . in their thirties and some in their forties, that want to get back into the academic educational thing, have a dreadful time, first of all convincing people that they are serious. After they convince

> their husbands, they have to convince an academic institution to help them along. In that connection, . . . one of the major myths is that education is wasted on women; they marry and give up their careers. The statistics show this is a myth. (I, 49)

Another possible means of aiding women--including by implication mature women--in becoming eligible for higher education at CUNY suggested to the Committee was to involve them among the ranks of the faculty. Rachlin again:

> We all know of a title that exists in the labor relations contract called Lecturer part-time. Now Lecturer part-time is a title designed specifically for youngsters (sic) who want to go on to get their graduate degrees, but at the same time, gain some experience teaching . . . I am not minimizing the fact that we ought to try to bring people in on the professional levels also, but I am suggesting that what we have not done is fully utilize the opportunities of that line of Lecturer to bring people in here and help them go through their doctoral degrees so they become eligible. (I, 229)

But, in the end, Rachlin went on, women will simply have to push harder and make stronger demands than they have done to date because, "The male sexist society isn't going to go in by itself. No power group that I have ever heard of has voluntarily given in particularly when it is jobs that are at stake." (I, 228)

Promotions

> For the past four decades, the numbers of women recruited into the lower ranks have been almost equal to the numbers of men--but the women remained in the lower ranks. Recruitment is a problem, but it will solve nothing without equal opportunity for advancement.
>
> Anna Babey-Brooke (I, 188-89)

The vast majority of witnesses at both of the Committee's public hearings were faculty women who addressed themselves to questions of promotion and job security, often by recounting personal experiences. Viewed separately, each individual's testimony appeared to be the unfortunate "horror story" of one person who had either been at the wrong place at the wrong time, or who was not sufficiently qualified for serious consideration. But, viewed as a whole, the individual incidents weave themselves into a pattern, conscious or unconscious, of inequities against women, be they faculty or administrative staff employees. This point is best proven by generously quoting from the available testimony.

Marlene Karakashian, assistant professor of biology, Queens College, remarked:

> . . . I have no evidence that any member of my department or college is discriminating against me because I am a woman. . . . I am here today because I believe that my experience may be part of a pattern at CUNY, a pattern which will not be revealed unless women like myself speak up, now. (I, 197)

Karakashian, who for a number of personal reasons willingly accepted a temporary line position at Queens College in September, 1969, for which even her acting department chairman acknowledged she was over-qualified, told the Committee of her subsequent experience:

> The position was one of teaching laboratories in the first year course in biology. I neither expected nor was given any faculty responsibilities that year.
>
> A regular faculty line became available during that year, 1969-1970, and it was offered to me at next to the lowest step of Assistant Professor. When I questioned the level of the offer, I was told by the chairman that I should feel lucky that he was able to get me "credit" for my first year of teaching at Queens. I pointed out that I was not a new Ph.D., that I had had a year of post-doctoral training and seven years of research experience, all supported by . . . federal grants, as well as a solid record of publications before I came to Queens . . . . When I asked if scholarship mattered at Queens, I was told it would matter in the future, that I would have to demonstrate continual scholarly activity in order to be advanced. (I, 198-99)

Discussing her subsequent application for admission to the graduate faculty at CUNY, Karakashian offered the following observations:

> . . . I was told by the chairman that there had been a lot of disagreement about me, that many of my colleagues . . .. felt that I had been hired to teach General Biology

and that this would be a bad precedent, that I had nothing to contribute to the graduate program and was merely seeking prestige. My application was forwarded to the executive office of the biology graduate program with the condition that I would be continuing to teach General Biology and would not be teaching a graduate course. There was clearly some sort of confusion . . . but I was finally appointed to the graduate faculty.

I am not, however, participating in the biology graduate program since I have not been asked to serve on any committees, grade any examinations or even serve as a faculty member of a graduate student committee. (I, 199-200)

Nor did her departmental status improve with time:

This fall, 1971, it was evident that my status was still less than it might be in the department. The departmental committee list revealed my name was missing from every committee in the department, except from the committee on faculty who teach the first-year course. . . .

It was evident that male colleagues of my longevity in the department were on several committees each. . . . I then requested a specific committee assignment which was of interest to me. I have not yet been appointed to this or any other committee. (I, 201)

Another series of complaints was registered by Sue Tolchin of Seton Hall, who had been a former member of the political science faculty at City College and Brooklyn College:

> During my own years of experience at the City University I finished my graduate work, earned my Ph.D. and wrote a book--all before I reached the age of thirty--yet each time I progressed, I was demoted yet another step further down the line of an institution professing to operate on the merit system. And at each point, the reasons seemed to center around being female. "Go to Hunter; they like women there," said the senior man at City College. "We've never given a woman tenure here in the political science department, and we probably never will." . . . I changed to Brooklyn College, where the situation seemed slightly better; at least women were hired in larger numbers as low level lecturers, and there were two senior women. At the time, I failed to notice that there were no women in the middle ranks. While at Brooklyn I earned my Ph.D., was reduced to part-time rank; then wrote a book and was not "re-hired" at all. The official reasons centered around my New York Ph.D. and other such formal minutia. One senior colleague told me I had an "ethnic problem." Had I not been forced to observe so many white males being recruited, courted and hired--white males without Ph.D.'s and without publications--I might have believed him. (Written Testimony)

Janet Messing, an associate professor of Economics at Lehman College, also capsulated her career development for the Committee. Convinced that credentials for promotion, specifically years of teaching experience and numbers of publications, do not as readily serve women as men, she noted

that in her own case, with both a C.P.A. and Master's degree, and seven years of industrial experience, she was hired in the late 1940s as a lecturer at minimum pay, at Hunter College, and told that she would not be eligible for a regular line appointment until she got her Ph.D.

> In 1959 when I received my Ph.D. degree, I was given the lowest possible rank of instructor again at minimum pay. . . . During the time of my appointment as an instructor--my beginning rank despite my years of teaching, industrial experience, and education--other persons (male) were appointed as assistant professors.
>
> Elsewhere in the University, it is to be noted that men had been appointed at full line positions up to the ranks of assistant professor with the C.P.A. and Master's degree alone.
>
> At the moment I can only add that I have not been promoted to full professor although, one of my former students holds such rank in the University without a Ph.D. degree--but, of course, he is a man. (II, 107)

Marilyn Sontag wrote the Committee to protest the requirement of a qualifying physical examination related to her duties as a graphic artist at the Hunter College Educational Technology Center:

> Yesterday morning, 14 March 1972, I took a "physical examination" as part of the audio-visual aid technician examination, #1066. . . . The test consisted of: 1) filling out a form indicating whether or not I had ever been physically or mentally ill, 2) being fingerprinted, 3) a perfunctory eye examination--reading the top line of a chart and identifying

red, yellow, and amber lights, 4) a hearing test which consisted of repeating the two numbers the examiner hoarsly growled while he held a book . . . in front of his mouth, 5) running an obstacle course, starting from a prone position and including scrambling or climbing or leaping a barrier, 6) lifting a 25-pound weight over one's head with one hand. . . .

Failure to lift the weight constituted failure of the entire examination. . . .

These tests are arbitrary, inconsistant with good sense or judgement, and inherently without value. At no time did I see a doctor, at no time were pulse rate or blood pressure checked, nor was there indeed any physical examination of my person. (Written Testimony)

In addition to their personal stories of discrimination on the basis of sex, several witnesses addressed themselves to issues which they considered reflective of the entire University regarding promotion and career mobility. One witness spoke of her thwarted efforts to make the transition from part-time to full-time faculty status:

Although I am an instructor, part-time, I am now completing my sixth semester at Hunter College. I hold the Doctorate degree from a fine university. I have already held the rank of assistant professor at a highly respected institution. . . . I am actively engaged in scholarly research.

To the best of my knowledge, I am the only member, quote, female in my discipline within the department who is in this inequitable and unviable position, . . . The rampant fraction-

alization of lines within the department perpetrates these injustices towards the equally qualified teacher. (II, 42-43)

Another cautioned that the increased number of female faculty members hired mostly at the lecturer rank by CUNY in connection with its Open Admissions program was not a sign of progress. "We are in danger of creating an under-class," said Margaret Donnelly, representing the Lehman College Chapter of the United Federation of College Teachers (UFCT). "56 percent of all women faculty are on the assistant professor level or below." (I, 106)

> What I am saying is that the majority of my faculty [Lehman College UFCT faculty] are women. The implication of my statement is that they have been added on the slave labor ranks of the faculty to maintain the crush of adding students for the Open Admissions program. The danger here, I think, in creating an under-class, . . . is . . . if these women who have been added to maintain the standards of the University for Open Admissions are on the ranks of lecturer and are in the area of remediation, then undoubtedly they are locked in under the present contractual arrangements, to the rank of lecturer, with limited salary, to say nothing of promotional opportunities. (I, 107)

A third witness addressed herself to the issue of equal pay for equal work. Sue Salmons of Queens College spoke to the Committee in behalf of three women on the administrative staff at Queens College, who she indicated, had not been promoted in five years, although they had assumed greater responsibilities. According to Salmons, these women were doing the same work as men in higher job titles:

> We have some comments to make on the failure of the administration to follow through on promotions. Basically, we

find a reluctance on the part of the administration to recognize women as administratives or doing administrative work. (I, 66)

Another CUNY-wide issue brought forth by witnesses was the BHE Gittleson policies. The Civil Service clerical, secretarial, and administrative assistant personnel in the CUNY system are referred to as Gittleson employees, after the state legislator, who in 1952, proposed the legislation which governs these positions at Central Administration and the colleges of City University. The three ranks of Gittleson employees in ascending order are: 1) College Office Assistant "A"; 2) College Office Assistant "B"; and 3) College Administrative Assistant "C." A Gittleson employee must pass a Civil Service examination to achieve each of the ratings. In a memorandum to the Committee, Diana Feld, a Gittleson employee in the department of Sociology, Lehman College, made the following criticisms about the current status of the CUNY Gittleson staff:

> 99½% of the Gittleson staff are women and as such are victims of blatant, overt discrimination because we are relegated to clerical positions. The nature of the job is such that no men are interested in applying.
>
> There are no career ladders leading to executive and management titles provided within the scope of the Gittleson categories. The "Administrative Assistant" or "C" title is the end of the line. (Written Testimony)

Hunter College President Jacqueline Wexler argued that the rigidities and limitations of the Gittleson jobs are caused less by CUNY than by the Civil Service system which:

I believe . . . was set up to protect social interests many, many decades ago. I think that the Civil Service system in many ways has come home to haunt us.

I think the fact so many jobs are so prescribed and delineated in CUNY makes it all but impossible for creative administrators to match the person to the task. I think if women campaigned for anything they ought to campaign for this. Civil Service has its own kind of tenure. It was there to protect certain kinds of things, but I think that the present state of the art is a rigidity that hurts CUNY, institutionally, and that hurts women very badly. . . . I argue with /the Civil Service people/ that unless it's possible for people who start out as secretaries to go on and upward within the internal system, that they are really playing fire with the Human Rights Movement. (II, 56-58)

Sarah Goichman, a Gittleson employee at Borough of Manhattan Community College, came before the Committee to relate how perturbed she was because she was trying to obtain her Bachelor's degree while working.

I was reported by my immediate supervisor, . . . for attending a course of study during my lunch hour. When I refused to withdraw, I was brought up on discriminatory charges. . . . he held that a lunch hour was for eating, only. We have already fought for our civil rights and . . . the right to the use of my own free time should be just that.

More important is the fact that in an enlightened edu-

> cational atmosphere, I am denied an education. I did take this job and the whole incentive was because I would be able to get a college education for free. I checked with the Union [Local 384, affiliated with District Council 37, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO], who confirmed that a College Office Secretary, . . . is entitled to a lunch hour to do with as I see fit. . . . I was removed from the accounting department. (I, 180-81)

Besides describing the immobility of both faculty and administrative staff women at CUNY, many witnesses appearing at the Committee's hearings suggested remedies to hasten the elimination of the discriminatory policies and practices which hinder the placement and advancement of women. Among other things, the Committee was advised to recommend to the Chancellor that faculty women employed in the CUNY system be considered as available for transfer to responsible administrative posts, such as deanships.

A review of the testimony also indicates two general requests by the witnesses concerning the granting of tenure and promotions to faculty women (and men). Some witnesses felt strongly that only women could implement affirmative action for women and that, therefore, their representation on departmental and college-wide Personnel and Budget Committees, which at CUNY have crucial decision-making power over tenure and promotions, was essential. "Would you consider the P&B Committees, and the chairmanships, important?" the Committee asked Dean Ruth Weintraub:

> Yes, they do all the hiring. A dean can have some influence, . . . a dean can say, remember when you go out and recruit, we are looking for women and . . . minority people, and a dean can inter-

> fere by insisting on interviewing all candidates in the professorial range and see to it that they aren't paid lower salaries; and by and large the deanships in the City University are held by men. The percentage [of women] on deanships is very fragile . . . (I, 53)

Other witnesses argued that although the presence of women on review committees enhanced the status of women, and precluded certain anti-female discussions, it did not necessarily guarantee the representation of women. Thus, they argued that the criteria currently used to examine candidates for tenure and promotion be overhauled, since it was currently male-oriented and allowed for only one kind of academic person to be upwardly mobile, the person who obtained her/his Ph.D. and immediately undertook research and began to publish. Remarked Dorothy Riddle:

> We have to take into consideration what I would call "life experience." There has to be some more flexible way of judging a woman than simply judging the publishing way. There is evidence that women tend to be involved in teaching rather than simply professional research. It is high time more status be given to teaching. Most of us are hired to do it. There are very few people hired to do research. . . . In Richmond College we try to set up four or five different criteria so . . . if a person has life situations such as children or any other kind of obligation outside of the institution or personal preference, this can be credited. (I, 32-33)

Margaret Donnelly suggested that the Committee concern itself with devising a promotion program for CUNY that considers alternatives to the

Ph.D. requirement. Under the present conditions of the faculty union contracts at CUNY, a move from the rank of lecturer or instructor to assistant professor requires the Ph.D. at the senior colleges. Because of family obligations, noted Donnelly, many women are unable to complete their Ph.D. degrees, and thus are unable to qualify for the move from the lower faculty ranks to the tenure-bearing line of assistant professor. (I, 109)

Because a statistical review of departmental and college-wide P&B Committees indicated that they are overwhelmingly male-dominated, some faculty women called upon the Committee to put an end to the secrecy of deliberations on these committees. The secrecy of P&B deliberations is a manifestation of the "fraternal" atmosphere that effectively blocks a woman's chance for advancement, they complained. Moreover, this manner of dealing with University problems and policies has all but eliminated women from making any contribution to that process. Sue Tolchin, for one, compared the abuses of discretionary power in government to that of a departmental P&B Committee:

> . . . where decisions are made in closed caucus, with hidden rationales and far-reaching effects. It is a world where disenfranchised groups, without clout and without power--like women--invariably suffer. (Written Testimony)

Gisele Corbiere Gille of City College commented that:

> . . . when most members of the review committee are men, there may be an undue influence of the administrators and of the deans . . . and it happens that very often a woman is the one who gets by-passed year after year and has to

wait a few more years for a promotion, while men are pushed over her. (I, 56)

Dorothy Riddle at Richmond College argued that when a woman candidate is denied a promotion, "We are unable to document this because of sex discrimination, because the president does not have to say why he turns down a candidate." (I, 29)

Interestingly, part of the testimony of a male witness, Dean Manson, tended to corroborate the allegations of the female witnesses:

> . . . I am a member of the P&B and I don't want to reveal what goes on, but I had a conversation with a member of the department who was a chairman and I asked him why his department had not promoted a woman who had been there for such a long time, when after I looked at her record, it seemed to be very impressive to me, and he said, "Well, she had written very many articles a long time ago; she hadn't written any articles since her last promotion."
>
> It was true that she was in a process of revising a text, . . . and out of compassion for her, [he had] assigned her to handling thesis students, rather than her having advanced courses in her field because he made, in my judgment, a pre-judgment that she was not qualified to handle the advanced courses. He added something else as a sinker, " And if she gets a promotion, the younger men in this department will resent it and some of them will quit." . . . I felt that he was mistaken and I spoke as eloquently as I could in behalf of this woman, . . . She was promoted. (I, 100-102)

The need to upgrade the status of the adjunct or part-time faculty members, a large percentage of whom are women, was discussed by Eve Harthheimer, an instructor at Hunter College:

> Women constitue a considerable percentage of the part-time . . . faculty teaching staff at Hunter College. The discriminatory practices against this body of part-time faculty is a grave injustice on these women who are denied all fringe benefits, such as vacation pay, . . . pension plans, health insurance, sabbatical leave. In addition, they are subject to wide exclusion from academic awards, such as grants, scholarships, etcetera, and exclusion from participation in crucial policy making department activities. There is a gross disproportion in the rate of pay for part-time teaching which exploits the women in this position and which constitutes an open violation of the principle of equal pay for equal work. (I, 41-42)

Several witnesses noted the gross inequities between the full-time and adjunct faculty members at CUNY, since the latter are paid on an hourly-scale basis, at about one third the rate of the full-time CUNY faculty. An analysis of this situation was presented to the Committee: A full-time lecturer has a median salary slot of roughly $15,000. Thus, a part-time lecturer, working half-time, receives half of this amount, or $7,500. By contrast, an adjunct lecturer with the same course load of a part-time lecturer, receives roughly $3,600. One witness called upon the Committee to investigate the number of women in the part-time lecturer and adjunct slots, predicting that a higher proportion of women would be found among the adjunct ranks.

Several other witnesses urged the Committee to recommend the legitimation of part-time appointments. A new policy should call for part-time appointments with pro-rated credit toward tenure, leave time, and participation in departmental activities. Mina Rees, president of the University Graduate Division, called to the Committee's attention the fact that for some time Princeton University had been operating with a policy that allowed a limited number of part-time appointments in the professorial ranks for both personal reasons and as a means of building distinction and strength within a department.

> This agreement on the part of Princeton was considered a major breakthrough because well qualified women, fully able to participate in college and university teaching and research, have been prevented from becoming regular members of the faculty because they were unable to participate during child-bearing years, and by being excluded at that point, were moved out of the mainstream of their field. (I, 9-10)

The experience of part-time appointments with men prompted Dean Ruth Weintraub of Hunter College to note that her college did not collapse because for 20 years a man was given six months leave without pay.

> He wanted to devote six months of his life to museum life and research and six months to teaching. We did that for 20 to the great benefit of the institution and to the furtherance of this man's career. . . . I am talking about what I think this Committee can do that . . . [it can] . . . urge the University to set up a category of part-time professional appointments that could lead to tenure, available to men

and women whose life styles include the necessities of greater flexibility in programming the period of their life. I don't consider that a special reward to women. I really think that can be worked out on a mutual benefit of a university. (I, 47)

Finally, the Committee also heard testimony to the effect that a study should be undertaken of the Civil Service pre-employment and promotional examinations to determine if they are biased against women. Several witnesses also suggested a review of the Gittleson job categories. Why doesn't CUNY review the job description qualifications needed of employees for these jobs, and develop a career-ladder leading to professional jobs? And, much effort was expended in trying to convince the Committee of the need to create a career-ladder within CUNY between the traditional, stereotyped women's jobs and men's jobs; that is, between the Gittleson positions and the entry administrative positions. Dorothy Riddle, for one, recommended, " /t/hat on-the-job training be provided for women staff members in order to ensure that they have all reasonable opportunities to qualify for advancement and to ensure more women in middle and upper management positions." (I, 22)

Salaries

> I have heard one female legislator say, "Don't give me general complaints. Tell me how much money you have lost. Men understand pay inequities. They will go along on that issue. . . ."
>
> Dean Claire Sprague (I, 158-59)

No discussion of inequities that exist for women in hiring and promotion is complete without raising the issue of salaries. Although salary discrepancies between men and women at the same faculty rank may be less at CUNY, because it operates under negotiated uniform salary schedules, the problem nevertheless exists, as the following excerpts from the testimony indicate.

Adrienne Berenson, an assistant professor at Queensborough Community College, expressed her opinion that the secrecy of the departmental Personnel and Budget Committee deliberations bore directly on salary questions:

> In one's first negotiation for salary, for example, it is not possible to know at which step other faculty with similar qualifications have been engaged. Not only I, but three other women instructors were engaged at the first step. In my case it was the lowest salary--$5300 in 1961. A young man with an M.A. like mine received $5700. He was given credit for previous high school teaching experience. Three other young men in subsequent years were put in step three. (I, 141-42)

Dr. Christine Antonopoulou, a lecturer at Queens College, recounted her personal experiences with sex discrimination, which were connected with both

CUNY's maternity leave policy and money issues. Antonopoulou was hired in 1963 by Queens College to set up the new foreign students' office. Five years later, in 1968, the foreign student population had grown to over 2000 and she was told by the Dean of Faculty to hire an assistant.

> I hired my assistant, a male, with a bachelor's degree. At that time I was taking my Master's degree. I was told that I must pay my assistant more money than I made, because that was the best way for me to get more money the coming year. I did hire my assistant with more money and with less qualifications with the promise that the coming year of 1969, I would be able to get more money. . . . After I requested the raise that was promised to me, I was told that unfortunately I could not get this raise due to budgetary crises, and furthermore, what would people say on campus if a woman gets so much money all of a sudden. They could not justify an increase of over $4000 that my assistant was getting, at that time. (I, 35)

Dean Ruth Weintraub of Hunter College contended that the social acceptability of discrimination against women grossly affected their salaries:

> Department chairmen, . . . think nothing of offering the woman less because she is married and because she has to be in the metropolitan area anyway and therefore can be recruited. . . . or if she is not married, offer her less because she does not have any children to support. (I, 50)

Betty Levy, an instructor (half-time) in the Education Department at City College, outlined her salary problems as "a good example of the Univer-

sity's unequal treatment of low-status, low-power, not-yet-degreed, junior female faculty" in a written grievance to the Committee:

> I was originally hired as a lecturer, part-time, which would have entitled me to benefits under the . . . UFGT contract. Three weeks after this letter of appointment, I received a letter informing me of a "technical error" in the first appointment and my rank was changed to that of instructor, half-time, . . .
>
> Having taught four semesters of the same course at the same status, with very positive observations and with a good reputation among my colleagues, I received a letter of "non-reappointment for budgetary considerations" from the chairman of my Department . . .
>
> Subsequently, a full-time faculty member in the Department received word that her sabbatical had come through, thus opening up three sections to be taught.
>
> I was verbally offered to continue to teach the same course, . . . two sections, only this time in the evening (a higher seniority male took the day sections) and on an adjunct basis. That is, instead of my prior position of . . . [a pro-rated part] of a full-time instructor's salary (which comes to $7,226 a year) I would be earning $285 a credit per semester (which comes to $4,560 for the same year's work). This amounts to a 37% cut in salary for the same job. It also means a demotion in rank entitling me to less benefits and less security. . . .
>
> It is interesting and significant that all of the indivi-

duals I have had contact with throughout this "firing and re-hiring offer" have been white, high-status, high-paid males in the University. (Written Testimony)

Policy-Making

> A good way for the Chancellor to show his good faith is to do a few things to the immediate structure that he controls. . . . the City University catalogue for 1971-72 lists 13 Chancellors and University Deans, not one on that list is a woman. I could not believe that there was anything like equality of opportunity in the recruitment and the selection of these staff persons . . .
>
> Dean Ruth Weintraub (I, 42-43)

One notable effect of the low faculty status of women throughout the CUNY system is their obvious absence from policy-making bodies--University-wide, college-wide, and departmental. There has been almost no female involvement in the creation of educational policies. Significantly, this issue was of concern to several witnesses, who considered themselves, as well as their female colleagues, capable of such a participatory role. One such witness, Gisele Corbiere Gille of City College observed:

> The greatest number of women [at City College] are still in the lower academic rank and there are many women in the lecturer and assistant professor rank. I do believe that this is just not by chance, because the women who make teaching in college their career, are as qualified as the men, and . . . [should] be promoted to the higher rank as soon as this would be possible; when women are kept in the lower rank, they are the first victims of any crisis, such as the budget crisis of this year, and they

also have less access to the economies that make the policies. . . . They have fewer chances of being a part of the appointments and the P&B Committee, especially in the departments where there are still very, very few women. . . .

We have had, in the last few years, a certain number of new administrators at [City] College, besides the president we have now, a provost and vice provost and among this rank of the higher administration, not one woman has been appointed, as yet. Among the deans of the College, there is a woman who is Dean of the School of Nursing, but nursing being mostly women, it is not surprising to have a . . . woman as Dean of that school.

Among the other academic deans we do not have a woman, yet, . . . I do think that in a large college where women form a large number of the teaching staff, there should be more women appointed to the higher administration posts. . . . (I, 54-56)

Rose Kiesler of Lehman College, in a letter to the Committee, expressed her belief that even when women are given equal opportunity with men on the faculty level, "There have been times when there was discrimination, especially in selection of committee membership." (Written Testimony) And, in another letter to the Committee, Dr. Charlotte Crowman of Manhattan Community College, made a similar point:

If your committee would look at the number of women

in the top administration positions, I think you could hardly conclude that the representation reflects the total number of women as faculty. This, of course perpetuates a male-dominated institution, and hardly gives an opportunity for women to participate on the important policy-making bodies and committees. (Written Testimony)

Parenthood

In accordance with the affirmative action guidelines issued by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) of the United States Department of Labor, the Committee was re-examining the New York City Board of Higher Education (BHE) maternity leave policy at the time of its public hearings. That policy reads, in part, as follows:

> As soon as a member of the instructional staff shall become aware of her pregnancy, she shall forthwith notify the president and may apply for a leave of absence. Such leave shall begin on February 1 or September 1, unless the conditions of the pregnancy require that the leave begin sooner. The duration of the leave shall be at least one full semester. In exceptional cases, if approved by the college physician, the president may terminate a maternity leave during a college term, provided there is an appropriate opening in which the applicant's service may be utilized. An extension of maternity leave shall be permitted on request for a period not in excess of one year from the end of the original leave. No further extensions shall be permitted.
>
> Maternity leaves shall be granted without pay during the period of the leave, including the vacation period concomittant to the leave. (BHE By-laws, Section 13.4)

The Committee had noted several discrepancies between this BHE maternity leave policy and the principles concerning maternity leave policies established by the OFCC, which a federal contractor must follow to be in compliance

with affirmative action standards for fair employment practices; and, shortly after the February 29, 1972 hearings, had submitted a revised maternity leave policy to the Chancellor for transmission to the BHE.

Although the BHE policy accepted childbearing as a justifiable cause for a leave of absence from work for a reasonable period of time, it tended to penalize women because they required this time away from work. It failed to define maternity leave as a temporary disability, that is, as a period of time when a woman is physically unable to work because of childbirth (or complications of pregnancy). It also incorporated a forced leave of absence and specified the time when maternity leave shall begin. While the policy did not state the number of months before childbearing that a woman must leave her employment, it did state the minimum length of time off a woman must take for pregnancy. Moreover, it was patronizing. Stated Dean Ruth Weintraub of Hunter College:

> . . . the By-laws of the Board of Higher Education still carry. . . . an absurd and antiquated maternity leave provision. . . It seems absurd and an invasion of privacy for a member of the instructional staff to have to forthwith notify the president when she is aware of her pregnancy. This must be immediately and publically declared. As a member of the Hunter College staff that became pregnant, that really annoyed me. . . . Is there any more reason for doing this than for a male member of the faculty to tell the president when he has a hernia; when he needs to be taken care of. (I, 43)

Testimony at the Committee's hearings primarily concerned the practical

aspects of childbearing and childrearing, such as the BHE maternity leave policy and CUNY child care facilities. But, it should be emphasized that the form these "rights" take reflects entirely on CUNY's accepted image of women's place in society. Seemingly it is because women are viewed first and foremost as childbearers that the present CUNY maternity leave policy tends to keep them away from their jobs much longer than they (and their doctors) have determined is necessary. Moreover, because women are presumed to be at home rearing children, the need to establish adequate child care facilities at each of the colleges of the University does not seem to be a priority. In short, the demand by women witnesses for new maternity and child care policies should be viewed in the context of the larger demand for a very different kind of society where neither women nor men have to choose between having a family and having an outside career.

Alice Winzer Lytton, a former CUNY faculty member, wrote the Committee to convey her feeling that her "career was unjustly and seriously damaged" by the BHE maternity leave policy:

> I was an instructor and assistant professor, Department of Mathematics, City College, during the years 1956-1961. I . . . would have been considered for tenure--there were open lines--and I am quite certain that I would have been given tenure had it not been for the fact that during my five years of service I would never teach beyond the required three years because I had three pregnancies. . . . I was thus forced to take a six months leave each time, not by choice, but by regulation. (Written Testimony)

Karen Osterman of the CUNY Office of Community College Affairs told of

her experience with the current maternity leave policy. She felt that for the year-round administrative employee, "There is no logic to the requirement that leave must begin on February 1st or September 1st, as the semester system has no relationship to the periods of her employment." (I, 85-86) While primarily addressed to the inequities of the treatment of persons in administrative titles, her comments were echoed by many of the CUNY women faculty:

> Many discriminatory pressures are subtle ones requiring attitudinal change in addition to legislative change. . . . But, in addition, a woman should be able to point to a realistic maternity leave policy which recognizes that maternity leave, like sabbatical, is designed because some women have a dual allegiance to child and career and that, if the university wants to retain capable and qualified people, they must make concessions.
>
> My first problem arose because of the time of delivery. Neither the February or September dates were relevant because I had conceived at an inappropriate period in relation to the academic calendar. Consequently, it was necessary to negotiate the time of my leave with my employer.
>
> I was told that I was expected to leave a month, or more, prior to my expected delivery. For many personal reasons, I wished to work for a longer period of time. My preference in the matter was neither asked nor considered, until I aggressively pursued it. (I, 83-84)

A number of witnesses made suggestions for a more acceptable maternity

leave policy. These included the premise that pregnancy is a "temporary disability," which should be treated in the same manner as CUNY treats other disabilities, and the premise that there should be no forced leaves of absence for pregnancy or childbirth. Jeanine Plottel, an associate professor of Hunter College, wrote the Committee saying that a woman "should not have to take a maternity leave and benefits should not be withheld as a result." Mina Rees, president of the Graduate Center, argued that women should be allowed "three months maternity leave with pay, twice, the second pointedly reflecting my attitude towards population growth." (I, 12) And, Dean Claire Sprague of John Jay College recommended that, "Women should be permitted to extend the probationary period for tenure for pregnancy or child care reasons, if they so desire." (I, 159-60)

Dorothy Riddle, assistant professor, Women's Studies, at Richmond College suggested:

> That women may not be prohibited from using their sick leave for any medical purpose, including pregnancy leave; and that extended leave, due to pregnancy be treated as an extension of regular leave.
>
> That all women faculty, staff, and students have the sole right to determine, in consultation with their doctor, when they will take pregnancy leave and when they will return to work; and that they be assured of reinstatement without loss of seniority, paid vacation accrual, or salary increments, or in the case of students, that they remain in good academic standing and be allowed to complete equivalent work for courses at home. (I, 22-23)

Riddle also recommended that the University provide adequate health care for women on the CUNY campuses, including family planning counseling and pregnancy testing. Among the proposals she presented to the Committee for consideration were:

> That free and confidential gynecological care be made available on the same basis as other medical services, for example, free for students; on an emergency basis for faculty and staff; that complete information regarding birth control and venereal disease be a part of these services; that a complete array of free or at-cost contraceptives be made available so that each woman will have free choice, regardless of age, marital status, or financial situation; and that abortion funds and abortion referral services be established at all branches of the City University. (I, 24-25)

And, she focused on the University health insurance plans, noting their purportedly inadequate provisions for pregnancy related hospitalization, proposing:

> That medical insurance provisions be revised so that medical expenses from all medical conditions and procedures, including the costs associated with pregnancy and its termination, be covered under the same allowance shhedule; and that costs associated with pregnancy and its termination be covered for all women, independent of marital status. . . .
>
> That total disability resulting from pregnancy not be excluded from full benefit coverage. (I, 23)

Because women historically have had the sole responsibility for child-rearing, those who have desired careers as well as children have most often had to give their careers a lesser priority. The demand on the part of many women that people other than mothers share the responsibility of childrearing has become a serious public issue and, as noted previously, involves philosophical as well as practical concerns. These issues are no less serious to the women at CUNY. A number of the witnesses recommended that free, parent-controlled child care centers be established on each of CUNY's campuses; others suggested that maternity leave be re-designated as parental leave, thus enabling fathers to partake more fully in the rearing of their children. Esther Milner, a professor at Brooklyn College, had an even more progressive proposal:

> . . . that the right of up to five year's leave for child-rearing purposes without loss of previous service or seniority after at least three years of uninterrupted service be built into academic contracts, and that annual sick leave allowances be usable as well for "family" purposes by both female and male faculty persons. (II, 78-79)

Drawing people into the childrearing process besides mothers may not be an easily achieved goal at CUNY. On the specific issue of child care centers one witness recounted the difficulties during 1970-71 that she and a group of women students heroically overcame to establish Child's Place, the child care center at Kingsborough Community College:

> There was a response to grant us funds to open a center. . . . However, . . . we had no space in which to open a center. . . . We began to explore the possibility of renting space off cam-

pus. . . . but they proved very expensive and the space was so limited that we couldn't think of it. Also, because of additional travel time or additional car fare--we have to pay an extra fare to get on campus--we felt it would have been too separated on the whole.

In mid-August, . . . Kingsborough changed presidents, and . . . President Goldstein granted us a large room for use as a day care center. . . . We hired two teachers. . . . We applied for the Board of Health licensing. The child day [care] center was born.

We opened our doors . . . on September 16, 1971 to three children of Kingsborough students from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. Presently we have 44 children enrolled and we open at 6:30 AM to 6:15 PM, Monday through Friday.

Most of our women are single parents, many with more than one child, they are from low income families, many are on welfare.

I would like to give you my experience as a mother who is travelling to Kingsborough Community College, Monday to Friday. I have two 8:00 classes per week and it takes me about an hour and a half to get to school. I have to wake my kids up some mornings at 5:30, just when they're turning over, but I think all in all, they think it's a blessed experience to be going to school with Mommy. They're so delighted to tell everybody about the campus and my niece and nephew are so jealous of them.

I am trying to show you it can work out and also it's not easy to start a working center.

There are hassles. You have to surmount certain difficulties and I think if you put your minds to it, . . . you will wind up doing it. There are many people who can tell you it cannot be done, but you have to show them that it can be done. . . . To this group, I would say if anybody wants to have such a thing going and, maybe, you, like other people, have greater demands for it, what you have to do is get together and fight for it. Maybe you can convince your president or whoever may be in charge . . . that you really need it, and demand it and fight for it, until you get the audience. (II, 91-95)

Grievances and Complaints

Members of the instructional staff at CUNY may appeal a decision with regard to matters in which they feel that they have been subjected to arbitrary or discriminatory practices, including reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The appeal is called a grievance procedure. The mechanism of the grievance procedure was established under the 1969 collective bargaining agreements between CUNY and the two faculty unions, the Legislative Conference and the United Federation of College Teachers. At present, this is the only institutional means by which an individual who believes that she has been a victim of sex discrimination can seek redress within the CUNY system.

Several of the witnesses that appeared before the Committee's public hearings had previously lodged formal grievances against the University on the grounds of sex discrimination. As a group they were disillusioned. They spoke about both the problem of inaction and the problem of harassment after having filed a grievance case, and called upon the Committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the grievance procedures as a possible means of correcting inequities arising out of sex discrimination. Ruth Cowan, a faculty member at New York City Community College, perhaps best articulated the frustration women who file complaints feel when they see absolutely no consideration given to their charges.

Cowan indicated that over 15 months had passed since she had filed a complaint with the New York City Human Rights Commission, "as a consequence of a decision not to grant me a promotion. . . . I charged that a decision not to promote me was the result of sex discrimination. In support of my charge I presented considerable evidence of the pattern and practice of sex

discrimination in my department generally," she wrote the Committee.

> In the 15 months that my complaint has been before the City Human Rights Commission, it has not proceeded through the first step. . . .
>
> The inaction of the Human Rights Commission encourages the belief that there are no available remedies for redress of individual wrongs. Its inactivity emphasizes the importance of handling the problem in a general way; namely, through the application of the Department of Labor's affirmative action standards at CUNY. . . . I think it imperative that there be a responsive mechanism for individual redress. (Written Testimony)

Adrienne Berenson of Queensborough Community College, perhaps best articulated the caution women feel about saying anything publically for fear of reprisals:

> Discrimination against women resulting most often in harassment is certainly not covered by the [Legislative Conference] contract as it now stands. The grievance representative [of Queensborough] pointed out that all grievable items be remediable which overlooks entirely the personal bias and insensitivity between colleagues experienced daily in an intangible manner. For example, procedures, which I may initiate will result, if successful, in the recall of this unsatisfactory annual evaluation, but nothing may be done about allegations, rumors, comments, made about me to other chairmen in the week in which my promotion was

being considered. (II, 124-25)

Witnesses mentioned several other disabilities caused or contributed to by CUNY policies or practices, including retirement pension plans which paid lower benefits to women than to men; health (hospital) insurance policies with higher premium schedules for female than male subscribers; and the policy of nepotism, whereby no two members of an immediate family may be employed by the same institution. Mention was made of several recent studies which have demonstrated that nepotism rules work to the extreme disadvantage of married women in academia, denying them employment. An end to such policies was requested. The Committee announced that it had learned that there was no formal nepotism rule in operation at CUNY that restricts husbands and wives from working within the same college, or for that matter, the same department. However, informal decisions on the part of department chairpersons may exist, which work to exclude women. The testimony of Susan Hoffman of the Hunter College Art Department, pointed this out:

> I met and married a man in the Art Department. The issue of the two of us teaching there didn't come up until he was voted tenure. At the time I was told by the Acting Chairman, . . . that since I was considered a qualified member of the Art Department, the Personnel and Budget Committee decided that the husband and wife cannot both be put on lines and be granted tenure. My program was reduced to half-time, which I have been teaching for the past three or four years. (II, 110)

Perhaps Dean Weintraub's testimony best expressed an ideal, non-biased viewpoint on the issue of employment and family relationship(s):

Recently we had, in my Division, the opportunity to hire candidates. The chairman of the [Anthropology] department came to see me, and he said, "I want to level with you, I am going to marry this girl (sic) in two months," and I said "Well, let's not be prejudiced against her just because she has the bad sense to marry you, and let's look at her as a candidate." I was convinced that she had the best qualifications of anybody that we were interviewing. She had a Ph.D. in anthropology at Harvard. There was no reason why she was going to be turned down because of marrying the chairman of the department. (I, 48)

Academic Curriculum

> . . . /the/ more subtle and complicated areas for research involve curriculum changes to incorporate women's experiences into existent and new courses and majors; . . .
>
> Dean Claire Sprague (I, 160)

The previously mentioned attitudes about women and their proper place in society are manifest, both explicitly and implicitly, in a university's academic curriculum. Judging from most college courses, women made no contributions worth recording in history, religion, literature, art, economics, politics, and so on. Although several undergraduate women's studies courses have been recently developed, the long neglect of subjects concerning women by and large continues, and the field of women's studies has yet to become a respectable academic specialty at CUNY.

Only a few witnesses spoke directly to this issue, but they implied that significant changes in the traditionally accepted academic programs are a vital aspect of women's drive for equality in higher education in general, and CUNY in particular. The testimony also indicated that educational policies at CUNY seem to resist the development of courses on women. Susan Hoffman, an adjunct lecturer in the Hunter College Art Department, tried to develop a course on women in art. She was supported by the chairman of her department and found a way to incorporate it into the department's offerings. Then she hit a snag:

> I invited thirty speakers, well known in the field . . . /but/ there was no way we could find within the structure

to pay these speakers anything or grant . . . them any token. This is a time when we have professors being paid $35,000 a year to act as art consultants to the college. (II, 110-11)

Margaret Fegan, discussed the course structure at Lehman College from a female student's viewpoint:

I realize that by simply speaking I am just putting my word against the entire male-dominated Lehman College system. . . .

First let me start with the courses. Would you believe that in a college where the ratio of women to men is three to one, there are only two courses that have anything to do with women; both in the English Department. One is a seminar that allows only fifteen students to even get into it. You must have the department head's written approval. Right away you can see this lets a great many who would like to take the course out. And a male probably said, "You're lucky to get that."

One of my friends compared Black and Spanish students and they combine to comprise roughly twenty-five percent of the student body. Yet, the Black Studies Department is excellent. It offers everything from history of various parts of Africa to courses in Swahili. The Puerto Rican Department is also excellent with several history and language courses. Every year both departments improve. Yet for women, the biggest minority of all, there is nothing. (II, 153-54)

Finally, Dorothy Riddle recommended that CUNY colleges review their library holdings and allocate money, "for the purchase of a comprehensive selection of books and periodicals on women and all aspects of women's history, heritage, and culture." In addition, she recommended:

> That the faculty of all academic departments and divisions, . . . review books and materials, including films, tapes, periodicals, etcetera, currently being used in courses for inaccurate and biased materials on women, sex-roles, and life-styles; and that all faculty be actively discouraged from using biased and inaccurate materials without accompanying critical commentary to point out such biases and inaccuracies. (I, 28)

PART III: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The term "affirmative action" means a plan of action designed by an employer to eliminate barriers to equal employment opportunities for all employees. Affirmative action in a higher education setting results from Executive Order 11246, issued by President Johnson in September 1965 (as amended by Executive Order 11375, issued in October 1968), which forbids federal contractors from discrimination on the basis of sex. The Executive Order requires federal contractors to practice non-discrimination in all aspects of their employment activity. Moreover, contractors are required, "to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their . . . sex. Such action will include but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; and rates of pay or other forms of compensation." Contractors are also required to take affirmative action wherever necessary to "remedy the effects of past discrimination" as well as to counteract current barriers to equal employment opportunity. Those with 50 employees and a federal contract of $50,000 or more must develop for each of their facilities a written plan for affirmative action. The plan must include an analysis and evaluation of employment and opportunities for the use of women and minority employees, as well as specific numerical goals and timetables for correcting existing discrimination.

Although the Executive Order is not law, but a series of rules and regulations that contractors must follow if they want federal funds, it has been used extensively by women in higher education, because prior to 1972

the threat of a cancelled contract was their only means of filing a discrimination complaint. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 forbids discrimination in employment based on sex, among other things, but it did not cover faculty and professional staff persons connected with educational institutions. Nor did the Equal Pay Act of 1963 apply to faculty and professional staff within the educational community. Both exemptions were only removed by amendment in the spring of 1972.

The Board of Higher Education adopted a resolution in December 1970 setting forth the University's affirmative action policy. Each component college of the City University of New York was to develop its own affirmative action program for the provision of equal employment and promotional opportunities for minorities and women, with overall coordination and monitoring to be performed by the University. Each college was also to appoint an affirmative action program coordinator: a senior college official who was to have sufficient authority to insure that the college program was effectively carried out and who was to report directly to the president. The Chancellor was to establish a Committee with the University-wide representation to provide the necessary policy direction for the University's affirmative action program. This Committee was to review the affirmative action programs of the individual colleges in keeping with the University's goals and a timetable for their achievement. In June 1971, the CUNY Affirmative Action Plan Committee adopted a City University Affirmative Action Plan. Each college was to submit its specific program and the five-year timetable for its achievement by December 1, 1971.

Because of the profound significance of affirmative action requirements for the improvement of the status of women in higher education, the Chancel-

lor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women took particular interest in CUNY's affirmative action program. The Committee attempted to invite the president and the affirmative action coordinator from each college to report on the progress of her/his respective program. To its surprise, the Committee discovered that the University-wide affirmative action program was considered to be far from adequate by a number of the witnesses. Professor Anna Babey-Brooke of Brooklyn College:

> The program suffers from severe malnutrition: it does not give the implementing office the autonomy or authority required to make for effective affirmative action. The program reeks of self-satisfaction in its statement that there is less discrimination at CUNY than at other institutions of higher learning.
>
> There is no room for self-satisfaction. It would be sad, indeed, if the City University of New York, with its non-elitist tradition of free education for the people of the City, were to lag behind private colleges. It is unnatural that CUNY should ever have countenanced discrimination in any form.
>
> The CUNY affirmative action program assumes that as more women and minorities are recruited into the colleges, the senior ranks will be divided equally between men and women of equal merit. The history of the University shows otherwise. . . . Finally, the CUNY affirmative action program was created by and is controlled by an administration which has been part and parcel of discrimination. It was created without any consultation from the very people whose professional lives are at stake. (I, 188-89)

The Committee also discovered that most affirmative action coordinators were men, many of whom did not seem sufficiently sensitized to the problems of women as a professional group. Dean Glenn Howard, affirmative action coordinator, Queens College:

> I did not anticipate that I would be appearing before this Committee since I assumed from the notice of its formation that those appearing would be women members of our University faculty and staffs, who are sensitive to the appointment and practices of their own institutions. (I, 122-23)

Testimony at the hearings revealed that several of the CUNY colleges were just beginning the process of forming affirmative action committees, although the Board of Higher Education requirement to have a written program on file had been applicable for several months. Dean Thomas Carroll, for example, reported that the Affirmative Action Committee of New York City Community College was "in the stages of being re-constituted." Dean Glenn Howard reported that Queens College, "does not have at the present time a committee on the affirmative action program."

> This was proposed about a year ago and was discussed and it was my suggestion, at that time, that we delay because the programs were new and we needed to see what action could be taken on campus to further the intent and spirit of the affirmative action program.
>
> I can report that we will have a committee . . . I suppose within a week or two weeks, such a committee will be created.
>
> The reason for doing this at this time arises out of the fact that the discussions which have been held at the College

> Personnel and Budget Committee, by representatives from the City University affirmative action program, and a rather informal act with groups and staff, indicate that we need a body that is primarily concerned with the progress on the affirmative action program and rather than depend entirely upon actions by the departmental chairmen and by the academic deans, it seems desirable not only to have a monitoring committee, but a promotional committee that might bring to the College information about candidates and sources of personnel . . . which the department may not have or may not have a chance to seek out. (I, 124-25)

The issue of female representation on the CUNY college affirmative action committees emerged as a major concern of the Committee. As the hearings unfolded, it became obvious that where these committees existed they were presidential; that is, appointed by a college president. The knowledge of the lack of representation of women in all the other areas of CUNY personnel underscored the importance of this practice. At the first public hearing, for example, Dean Julius Manson indicated that the Affirmative Action Committee at Baruch College consisted of three males. "We can put women on," he said, but, "When I take a look at how many women we have on the faculty and how overburdened they are, I would be worried about it." (I, 105) However, by the time of the Committee's second hearing, the Baruch Affirmative Action Committee had been considerably expanded, and included five new female members, according to the testimony of Clara M. Lovett. (II, 14, 17)

What should be included in a good affirmative action plan? This ques-

tion was on the mind of the Committee, especially at the time of the public hearings, due to the fact that University policy had delegated the responsibility for insuring equal opportunity for employment and advancement of women and minorities to the colleges. The Committee discovered, unfortunately, that few of the CUNY colleges appeared to have well thought out affirmative action programs, that included not only a functioning, broadly-based committee, but also a plan with definitive goals, timetables, and procedures for implementing the plan. The reason for this, the Committee was repeatedly told, was that many faculty members perceived numerical goals as favoring the hiring of women and minority groups against white males, and thus opposed their development as part of any required affirmative action plan. Dean Claire Sprague confronted this controversy:

> We have all been asked whether, in our efforts to redress inequities, we are not re-instituting the quota system. . . . If I report that although 22 percent of all faculty nationally are women and only nine percent are full professors, and that an even smaller number are chairmen, or high-ranking administrators or trustees, and go on to suggest that their representation be increased, am I re-instituting the quota system of old? Setting numerical and percentage goals is admittedly dangerous. . . . However, to compare current efforts to end demonstrated discrimination to the exclusionary quotas used for Jews, Italians, and others is to compare two different things. The current goals are meant to include rather than to exclude, a vastly different intent and action. (I, 157-58)

One of the more impressive affirmative action plans presented to the

Committee which did, in fact, develop target goals and timetables was prepared by LaGuardia Community College. Dean Irving Goldberg:

> In accordance with the over-all CUNY affirmative action [program], LaGuardia has undertaken the following:
>
> One, the College has developed a plan to insure equal opportunity for all qualified persons regardless of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin.
>
> It provides specific affirmative action procedures for recruitment, job development, advancement, recognition of accomplishment, treatment with regard to College activities, orientation of new employees, and conduct of complaints and investigations.
>
> Two, the College has established five-year employment targets for all ranks and titles in accordance with its affirmative action plan.
>
> Three, the College has established an Affirmative Action Committee representing all major divisions. This Committee consists of ten members, including four women and three minority group representatives.
>
> The Committee's mission is to see that the College's affirmative action plan is fully implemented in all aspects. It will develop recommendations and guidelines for recruitment and hiring of new personnel, provide information concerning vehicles for advertising and potential personnel sources, and will audit and evaluate actual hiring experiences.
>
> Four, the College has conducted an audit of its current

distribution of personnel at all ranks and titles; . . .

Five, the Affirmative Action Committee is now reviewing 1972-1973 divisional personnel requests in terms of the current distribution of females and minority group members in each division.

The Committee will recommend divisional hiring patterns for the 1972-1973 year, according to the College's five-year affirmative action plan, and will provide guidelines for advertising and recruitment of new personnel. (I, 206-208)

A strong affirmative action program needs implementation. After reviewing the affirmative action policies developed by some of the CUNY colleges, the Committee inquired into the various methods the colleges might use to force implementation of the directives. Once again, the testimony of the witnesses gave the unfortunate impression that CUNY colleges were hesitant about aggressive action to eliminate sex discrimination. Dean June Murray indicated that there was no provision built into the City College plan for a follow-up on whether recommendations were implemented. (I, 121) Dean Howard expressed his opinion that what a college affirmative action committee "can do to move action in both the departments which have control over promotions and the academic administration, which has ultimate say" is a problem. An affirmative action committee seems to be "a persuasive device as well as a monitoring device," but "I think we don't know for sure . . . how effective it can be." (I, 131) President Joseph Shenker of LaGuardia Community College in reply to a Committee inquiry concerning his methods of checking whether departments made an effort to recruit women or minorities, stated that, "We

didn't use special efforts":

> One possibility would be to require interview records to be kept by the various persons who are doing the employment, and if these records are complete, a review . . . would indicate . . . if an attempt has been made to recruit persons. (II, 119)

PART IV: THE CONCLUSION

> . . . women must remember that the roots of the inequities we have been describing taint all human beings--male and female. If women suffer from low expectations and a desire to avoid success, men suffer from high expectations and the compulsion to succeed.
>
> Dean Claire Sprague (I, 163)

The pattern for women at the City University of New York that was revealed in the Committee's public hearings is broadly the same as in the society of America: they either work in female dominated job categories or they are such a relatively small percentage of a faculty that they are effectively isolated from the academic reward system. Although sex discrimination in academia does not begin at college, most colleges are environments where women are at best tolerated, but never treated as equals. At CUNY women have begun to organize and to examine their status as faculty, staff, and students. The testimony of these public hearings is a very clear demand for changes in the CUNY system--in recruitment practices, promotional policies, curriculum content, and so on. It is a demand for the University to assume once and for all a leadership role in the fight to further equal employment opportunity for women, and by implication, equitable treatment for all. Professor Anna Babey-Brooke:

> Of all the institutions in our society, it is the university which should be in the forefront of the struggle to eliminate discrimination. Its existence over the years

has been in conflict with the mission of the university to take a leading role in perfecting our society. But the truth is that discrimination has existed and does exist in our University as in other universities. . . .

Now the University has accepted the fact of discrimination and the need to act against it. Chancellor Kibbee's statement on women was a commendable step in the right direction. It is now time to advance from recognition of discrimination to the elimination of discrimination. The Committee before which we are testifying today, . . . /is/ a beginning. But we must not continue to investigate and gather statistics over and over again. They prove the obvious. . . . In fact, there exists enough now to begin to move forward with remediation for individuals and changes to ensure to all members of the University staffs equal opportunity . . . (I, 185-87)

APPENDIX

PUBLIC HEARINGS TESTIMONY: WITNESSES IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE

February 29, 1972

Mina Rees	University Graduate Division
Dorothy Riddle	Richmond College
Christine Antonopoulou	Queens College
Ruth Weintraub	Hunter College
Gisele Corbiere Gille	City College
Ellen Mintz	York College
Paulette Roy	University Graduate Division (alumnae)
Sue Salmons	Queens College
Ann Sutherland Harris	Hunter College
Julius Manson	Baruch College
Karen Osterman	Office of Community College Affairs, BHE
Margaret E. Donnelly	Lehman College
June Murray	City College
Glenn Howard	Queens College
Thomas Carroll	New York City Community College
Isabel Krey	Kingsborough Community College
Adrienne Berenson	Queensborough Community College
Frances Barasch	Baruch College
Claire Sprague	John Jay College
Anna Babey-Brooke	Brooklyn College
Sandra Adickes	New York City Community College
Michael Milenkovitch	Lehman College
Ruth Cowan	New York City Community College

Sarah Goichman	Borough of Manhattan Community College
Despoina Ikaris	Kingsborough Community College
Marlene Karakashian	Queens College
Beryl Weinberg	Legislative Conference
Marcella Maxwell	Medgar Evers College
Irving Goldberg	LaGuardia Community College
Leigh Marlowe	Borough of Manhattan Community College
Norman Bailey	Queens College
Carl Rachlin	Hunter College
Faith Ringgold	City College (graduate); N.Y. Public School Teacher
Dee Alpert	New York N.O.W.
Hubert Vincent	Queens College, SEEK Program
May B. Siegel	York College

PUBLIC HEARINGS TESTIMONY: WITNESSES IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE

April 27, 1972

Charlotte Muller	Center for Social Research
Gloria Loft	Baruch College
James Colston	Bronx Community College
Paulette Roy	University Graduate Division (alumni)
Shirley B. Knight	Richmond College
Eve Harthheimer	Hunter College
Jacqueline Wexler	Hunter College
Esther Milner	Brooklyn College
Aida Devaleila	Baruch College
Claudette Murray	Kingsborough Community College
Hattie Bradlow	City College
Carmen Aita	Queens College
Janet Messing	Lehman College
Susan Hoffman	Hunter College
Joseph Shenker	LaGuardia Community College
Adrienne Berenson	Queensborough Community College
Carmen Hernandez	City College
Cisley P. Stewart-Huntley	Hunter College
Carmen Torres	City College
Marcella Maxwell	Medgar Evers College
Margaret Fegan	Lehman College